



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

New World are done by Mr. E. J. Payne; the Ottoman Conquest is by Professor J. B. Bury; the Economic Changes by Professor William E. Cunningham, and Catholic Europe by Rev. William Barry, whose Roman Catholic point of view stands in striking contrast to the chapter on The Eve of the Reformation by Henry C. Lea, a strong and clear presentation of the conditions leading to the Protestant Revolution, which is to be the subject of the second volume of the series.

These are the more salient chapters which may serve as illustrations. The high standard of scholarship of the individual parts is assured by the names of the contributors; the list represents an unusually strong group of specialists. This very fact, however, doubtless emphasizes the changes of style and manner of presentation, the divergence in the point of view often resulting in quite a different interpretation of the same facts. There is likewise a conspicuous unevenness or lack of proportion. The same facts and events are often treated repeatedly, while others of equal importance receive but a passing mention or escape notice altogether. Much of the material in the chapter by Mr. Leathes on Italy and her Invaders is found again in the essay on Rome and the Temporal Power by Dr. Garnett. The life and policy of Alexander VI are treated three times, while Julius II receives even more attention. Yet Huss is not mentioned. Many of the familiar names of humanism are excluded to make room for others more obscure, while the extraordinary detail as to the names and titles of books comes very near marring even the excellent style and work of Professor Jebb. More serious still is the meagre attention given to art and architecture. No volume on the Renaissance can be adequate if it ignores, whether intentionally or by accident, the significance of these two phases of human activity. Nowhere, not even in the literature of the period, is the great awakening of the human mind, and its return to the ancient civilization, more conspicuously seen than in art and architecture, yet these subjects are entirely pushed aside to make place for accounts of political policies, intrigues and often wearisome details of wars among petty Italian states. These are characteristic of the age, it is true, but they illustrate rather its negative side; they do not show the deep and widespread revival of thought, the intense intellectual and productive activity which one usually associates with the Renaissance.

But, notwithstanding the exception that may be taken to some of its individual features, the present volume is a very welcome addition to historical literature. The work planned by the great scholar, and ably carried on by the editors is much needed by the English reader, and the high standard of scholarship maintained in the first volume is a satisfactory earnest of the excellence of those which are soon to follow.

W. E. LINGELBACH.

University of Pennsylvania.

A History of the American People. By WOODROW WILSON, Ph. D., Litt. D., LL. D. In five volumes. Price, \$17.50. New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1902.

President Wilson has chosen a title for his work very similar to that of

Professor McMaster's "History of the People of the United States." In these two works we have represented the two schools of historic writers. Their methods of treating their subject stand at the remotest corners of the field of history. Taking the two works as typical of the two schools, the first striking difference is in the scope of the two undertakings, one covering the four hundred years from Columbus to the late war with Spain, the other dealing, as far as completed, with the forty years from the adoption of the Constitution to the Jacksonian era. The difference in spirit and method is even greater than the difference in scope. Mr. Wilson deals with abstractions and broad generalizations which seek to give us the whole essence of an historical period without our going to the wearisome trouble of viewing the facts from which these abstractions are presumably made. Mr. McMaster gives us those details, and so arranges and groups them, that the reading compels the mind to accept the opinion that the author holds but does not express. What we carry away from Mr. Wilson's book is the pleasing phrase in which he has given us his judgment. Mr. McMaster allows the reader to see the facts and arrive at an opinion by the logical process of deduction.

The comparison of the schools as represented in these two authors might be carried on indefinitely, for never were two authors more antithetical in the execution, as well as in the whole conception, of their work; but perhaps it will be more profitable to compare Mr. Wilson's work with its title. It promises a history of the people, and yet it is but a history of the politics of the people. We look in vain for anything but names on the subjects of religion, art, literature and science. Legal, economic and institutional questions of the greatest interest are ignored or slighted. Social forces that are of the greatest moment in the history of a people are not noted. The author's interests are with men and their political activities, and in the portrayal of these he proves himself an artist.

In the summary treatment of the several historical periods, the specialist recognizes that the facts often lie behind opinions and comments, but the untrained reader is not permitted to see them. This method of writing is Mr. Wilson's ideal of historical production. The reader has only to accept the results, while the historian does the work, which is satisfactory enough if one is simply interested in conclusions and generalizations and could be sure that the data of the field had been well considered. The very size of the undertaking, however, assures us, in this case, that the data have not been well considered. The original matter that must have been consulted in order to warrant such generalizations is too vast.

Still, there was another method of work which was left open to the author, if he wished to be the great synthetic and philosophical historian of the American people. He might have availed himself of the numerous monographs written by men who have gone to the original sources, but although we have evidence in some cases of familiarity with the more prominent workers in special fields, we do not feel that Mr. Wilson has given us more than a small measure of the results of analytical scholarship in American history. Too often the first-hand information has filtered through several

secondary histories before it reaches Mr. Wilson's work, and has had its meaning reversed in the process of filtration.

The work is an able summary of American political history. As evidence that Mr. Wilson is abreast of the historical scholarship of the day bearing on political aspects, it is to be noted that he has embraced the lately advanced opinion of Professor Osgood, of Columbia, that the colonial history must be studied from the European side, and that the colonies were only a phase of the European history of the age. Especially in the treatment of the navigation acts has he seized upon the recent theories of Professor Osgood, and shown the harmlessness of the restrictions in actual practice. He accepts the conclusions of Egerton and Mellen Chamberlain that there was no intentional tyranny on the part of the British ministry, but only an insistence upon constitutional and legal forms rather than a statesmanlike acceptance of existing facts. "They did not know whereof Mr. Burke spoke when he told them that the colonial assemblies had been suffered to grow into a virtual independence of Parliament, and had become in fact, whatever lawyers might say, co-ordinated with it in every matter which concerned the internal administration of the colonies; and that now it was too late to ask or expect the colonists to accept any other view of the law than that which accorded with long established fact." Of King George, Wilson says, "The nature of the man was not sinister. Neither he nor his ministers had any purpose of making 'slaves' of the colonists. Their measures for the regulation of the colonial trade were incontestably conceived upon a model long ago made familiar in practice, and followed precedents long ago accepted in the colonies. Their financial measures were moderate and sensible enough in themselves, and were conceived in the ordinary temper of law-making. What they did not understand or allow for was American opinion. What the Americans, on their part, did not understand or allow for was the spirit in which Parliament had in fact acted. They did not dream with how little comment or reckoning upon consequences, or how absolutely without any conscious theory as to power or authority, such statutes as those which had angered them had been passed; how members of the Commons stared at Mr. Burke's passionate protests and high-pitched arguments of constitutional privilege; how unaffectedly astonished they were at the rebellious outbreak which followed in the colonies." Thus the author has softened somewhat the harsher judgments of the more scientific, though less artistic and sympathetic, special students who have, of late, tended to swing too far in the opposite direction from the old, excessively patriotic writers like Bancroft.

The bearing of Mr. Wilson as an historian is admirable. He is suave and not easily drawn into passionate denunciation or invective, and yet he does not lack in boldness of judgment. In the treatment of the history after the adoption of the Constitution there is an admirable balance between extreme Northern and Southern views, a position such as few men beside Wilson could have taken. There is a democratic bias, if any, but an imperceptible fairness in spite of natural sympathies.

Mr. Wilson has declared, as his theory of writing history, that the historian must select from among the mass of events that which is char-

acteristic, and then he must throw all the light upon that event that his sources will permit. Such a canon of selection is of value only to the artist, and the thing selected will be determined by the tastes of the historian rather than by his reason. In the history before us the events that are emphasized are often only the personal interests of Mr. Wilson, and not the historically most important or characteristic matters. He often subordinates because the general reader will not be attracted by the theme, and expands because there is limited human interest, though perhaps great economic and institutional importance. Mr. Wilson's method of study gives an uneven effect. His intention is to study closely what he decides is important, but, in this way, he often fails to realize what is important.

Occasionally there is such a treatment of a period as suggests incomplete mastery of the subject. There is no adequate approach to the War of 1812, and when the reader is plunged into that war he feels aggrieved that the transition had not been plainly enough indicated to have avoided the shock. The author seems to have greater interest in immediate than in ultimate causes. But even this hypothesis will not explain some of the faults of proportion. Why should the Mexican War and the Ku-Klux Klan each be allotted three pages? Does the Revolution get twice as much space as the Civil War because Mr. Wilson knows more about the former? Why is the Missouri Compromise notably slighted, while Bryan's free silver campaign is spun out to an inordinate length? The Trent affair and the Gettysburg campaign both dwindle as compared with Sitting Bull.

The literary execution of the work is of a high character, but hardly equal to that of the masterpiece of biography, Mr. Wilson's "Life of George Washington." It is, however, bold, dignified and archaic, never losing its historical tone in unhistorical passion. The use of archaic words and phrases is especially effective in lending a fitting atmosphere to the treatment of colonial matters. None but a true man of letters could have given the work its fine literary flavor and form.

The make-up of the book renders it far more imposing than it really is. It may be stated, the five volumes could easily be reduced to two, but the heavy paper, the deep margins, a wilderness of injudiciously chosen pictures, for which Mr. Wilson is not responsible, and a sumptuous binding, produce a volume so ponderous as to be unwieldy. There is an unfortunate predominance of fancy pictures rather than representations of real historical objects.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

Washington, D. C.